

## REMARKS

The final Office Action of December 8, 2008, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 2, 7-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-21 have been amended herein. New claims 23-30 have been added. Claims 3-6, 9, and 22 have been canceled herein. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. An Information Disclosure Statement is being submitted concurrently herewith, citing U.S. Patent No. 5,991,799 to Yen et al.

### Claim Rejections

Claims 3, 9, 11, and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. These claims have been deleted or amended herein, and the rejection of these claims is believed to be moot.

Claims 1, 5-7, 10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Patterson. Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to refer to how the interactive information is presented in relation to the broadcast portion of the display in one embodiment (see, e.g., FIG. 2A and corresponding description on pages 13-14). Independent method claim 16 has been amended in a similar manner. Applicants submit that the amended claims are distinguishable over Patterson.

Claims 2-3, 9, and 21-22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Kikinis. Dependent claim 2 has been amended to clarify its scope, and the other rejected claims have been canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claim 8 was rejected as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Nakano et al. Claim 8 has been amended herein to clarify its scope. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Merriman. Claim 14 has been amended to clarify its scope. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 15 and 20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Kikinis and Merriman. These claims have been amended to clarify their scope. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Claims 16 and 18-19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Patterson in view of Kikinis and Merriman and Yuen. Independent claim 16 has been amended herein to clarify its scope. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

New independent claim 25 is similar to amended independent claim 1, but is directed generally to the embodiment of FIG. 2B (see also specification at pages 14-15). New independent claim 28 is similar to amended independent claim 16, but is also directed generally to the embodiment of FIG. 2B. Accordingly, Applicants believe that these claims are also allowable. Dependent claims 26-27 and 29-30 recite specific features of this embodiment.

### **CONCLUSION**

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account 19-0733 in the appropriate amount.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: May 8, 2009

By:

/Bradley C. Wright/  
Bradley C. Wright, Reg. No. 38,061  
1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001